

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 807

EA 032 787

AUTHOR Banjerdsakul, Natee; Lindsey, Jimmy D.
TITLE Building Administrators' Knowledge, Disposition, and Performance Competencies for Technology Integration for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities.
PUB DATE 2002-11-06
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (31st, Chattanooga, TN, November 6-9, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Behavior; *Administrator Role; Disabilities; Educational Methods; Educational Resources; *Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Needs Students; Student Needs; Technological Literacy

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate building administrators' knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies for technology integration for students with mild/moderate (M/M) disabilities. A total of 106 administrators participated in the study, completing a four-section questionnaire. One-way between-subjects designs were used, and the factors were professional and school characteristics, technology integrations, practice activities, and special-education experience. The dependent variables were the subjects' assessment of their technology-integration knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies. SPSS 7.5 descriptive, parametric, and nonparametric modules were used to analyze the data. Results indicated that subjects agreed that the 10 knowledge, 10 disposition, and 10 performance competencies were essential for promoting technology integration for students with M/M disabilities. Results also suggested that school type and number of students with M/M disabilities affected the administrators' knowledge and performance competencies. Additionally, subjects recommended that professional development, software, technology budget, collaboration, and community involvement are the major areas that need to be addressed if schools are to promote technology integration for students with M/M disabilities. (Author)

**BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS'
KNOWLEDGE, DISPOSITION, AND PERFORMANCE
COMPETENCIES FOR TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION
FOR STUDENTS WITH MILD/MODERATE DISABILITIES**

Research Display Session

Conducted at the

**MidSouth Educational Research Association Conference
Chattanooga, Tennessee**

By

**Natee Banjerdsakul, Ph.D.
Baton Rouge, LA**

**Jimmy D. Lindsey, Ph.D.
Southern University – Baton Rouge, LA**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

November 6, 2002

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Banjerdsakul

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate building administrators' knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies for technology integration for students with mild/moderate (M/M) disabilities. The accessible population was 177 administrators in a metropolitan area (southeastern state), and a stratified, randomized sample technique was used to select a sample of 151 administrators to serve as subjects. One hundred six administrators participated in the study, completing a four-section questionnaire. One-way between subjects designs were used and the factors were professional (e.g., highest degree) and school (e.g., school type) characteristics, technology integration – practice activities, and special education experience. The dependent variables were the subjects' assessment of their technology integration knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies. SPSS 7.5 descriptive (e.g., mean, SD), parametric (MANOVA and ANOVA), and non-parametric (Kruskal Wallis H-Test) modules were used to analyze the data. Results indicated that subjects agreed that the 10 knowledge, 10 disposition, and 10 performance competencies were essential for promoting technology integration for students with M/M disabilities. Results also suggested that school type (e.g., elementary, middle, high school, university laboratory/BESE) and number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled (1-14 vs. 16 or more students) affected the administrators' knowledge and performance competencies. Additionally, subjects recommended that professional development, software, technology budget, collaboration, and community involvement are the major areas that need to be addressed if schools are to promote technology integration for students with M/M disabilities.

General Research Questions Guiding the Study

Knowledge Competencies

Do professional characteristics (e.g., degree in special education, position, and years of administrative experience), school characteristics (e.g., school type, number of teachers employed, total students enrolled, and total students with M/M disabilities), technology integration and practice (limited and extensive) affect building administrators' assessment of knowledge competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities?

Disposition Competencies

Do professional characteristics, school characteristics, technology integration and practice, and special education experience affect building administrators' assessment of disposition competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities?

Performance Competencies

Do professional characteristics, school characteristics, technology integration and practice, special education experience affect building administrators' assessment of performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities?

Recommendations for Future Practice

What are building administrators' recommendations for future technology integration practice for students with M/M disabilities?

Method

Subjects

The accessible population was 177 building administrators in a metropolitan area (southeastern state), and a stratified, randomized sample technique was used to select a sample of 151 administrators to serve as subjects. Of the 151 building administrators, 106 agreed to participate in the study and completed a three-section questionnaire. Table 1 presents the subjects' general, professional, and school characteristics and their technology integration and practice and special education experience.

Research Design and Analyses

One-way between-subjects designs were used to conduct this study. The factors for these designs were building administrators' professional characteristics (e.g., degree in special education, position, years of administrative experience), school characteristics (e.g., school type, number of teachers employed, total number of students enrolled, number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled), technology integration and practice (limited vs. extensive), and special education experience (limited vs. extensive). The dependent measures were the building administrators' assessment scores for knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities (secured by Section III, Part I, II, and III of the researcher-developed instrument). SPSS 7.5 descriptive (e.g., cross tabulations, frequency distributions, means, medians, standard deviations, and ranges), parametric (e.g., MANOVA and ANOVA), and non-parametric (Kruskal Wallis H-Test) modules were used to analyze the data. Null hypotheses were tested at $p < .05$ level.

Instrumentation

The instrument, a four-section survey questionnaire was developed and used in this study. Section I, General, Professional Characteristics, and School Characteristics, obtained general demographic and professional information. Section II, Technology Integration and Practice and Special Education Experience, contained 11 items related to subjects' technology integration and practice and special education experience. Section III, Assessment of Knowledge, Disposition, and Performance Competencies, composed of a list of 10 knowledge, 10 disposition, and 10 performance competencies related to building administrators' promotion, enhancement, and assistance in integrating technology for students with M/M disabilities. A four-point Likert scale was used to indicate subjects' level of agreement or disagreement with each competency. Finally, Section IV, Recommendations for Future Technology Integration and Practices, was an open-ended question asking subjects to write their recommendations for future technology integration for students with M/M disabilities. The reliability coefficient for the knowledge, disposition, and performance competency items were .9570, .9543, and .9545 respectively.

General Procedures

This study was conducted using the following general procedures: obtaining permission to conduct the study; randomly selecting the subjects; administering the questionnaire; scoring, coding, storing, and analyzing data using SPSS 7.5 (for Windows) descriptive and inferential statistical procedures.

Results

Descriptive statistical findings suggested that building administrators agreed that the 10 knowledge, 10 disposition, and 10 performance competencies posed in this study (see Figure 1-3) were essential for promoting technology integration for students with M/M disabilities. The subjects' mean scores for the 10 knowledge competencies ranged from a low of 3.37 (K5) to a high of 3.59 (K1) (see Table 1), for the 10 disposition competencies ranged from a low of 3.28 (D6) to a high of 3.67 (D10) (see Table 2), and for the 10 performance competencies ranged from a low of 3.37 (P3) to a high of 3.52 (P7) (see Table 3). The overall or grand mean for the 10 knowledge competencies was 3.49, for the 10 disposition competency items was 3.52, and for the 10 performance competencies was 3.45.

Results of inferential statistical procedures (e.g., MANOVA, ANOVA, and Kruskal Wallis H-Test) indicated that of the nine factors investigated (e.g., degree in special education, position, years of administrative experience, school type, number of teachers employed, total number of students enrolled, number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled, technology integration and practice, and special education experience) school type and number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled affected building administrators' assessment of knowledge competencies [Wilks' Lamda = .591, df (30.00, 273.65), $p < .008$; Wilks Lamda = .795, df (10.00, 95.00), $p < .012$] (see Table 4), number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled affected building administrators' assessment of disposition competencies [Wilks' Lamda = .808, df (10.00, 95.00), $p < .021$] (see Table 5), and school type affected building administrators' assessment of performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities [Wilks' Lamda = .558, df (30.00, 273.649), $p < .002$] (see Table 6).

Assessment of knowledge competencies

With respect to subjects' assessment of knowledge competencies and their school type, university laboratory/BESE school building administrators had significantly higher mean assessment scores than those building administrators from high schools and middle schools on knowledge competency K4 (i.e., roles and responsibilities in implementing a technology plan for students with M/M disabilities), K7 (i.e., best practices, strategies, and research for effective staff development models for technology integration), and K9 (i.e., best practices and strategies to acquire and allocate funds and resources to support the use of technology) (see Table 7). By number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled, building administrators who had 16 or more students with M/M disabilities enrolled in their schools (Group 2, above median - $Mdn = 15$) had significantly higher mean assessment scores than those who had 1 to 14 students with M/M disabilities enrolled (Group 1, below the median) on knowledge competencies K2 (i.e., goals for using technology in special education), K3 (i.e., benefits and impact of

technology on students with M/M disabilities), K6 (i.e., technology skills and attitudes of current teachers working with students with disabilities), K7 (i.e., best practices, strategies, and research for effective staff development models for technology integration), and K8 (i.e., effective and ineffective uses of various technologies and strategies for evaluating the technology plan) (see Table 8).

Assessment of disposition competencies

With respect to subjects' assessment of disposition competencies and number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled, building administrators who had 16 or more students with M/M disabilities enrolled in their schools (Group 2, above median - *Mdn* = 15) had significantly higher mean assessment scores than those who had 1 to 14 students with M/M disabilities enrolled (Group 1, below the median) on disposition competency D1 (i.e., special education laws, policies, and procedures should be upheld to protect the rights of students with disabilities) and disposition competency D3 (i.e., building administrators should have clear ideas about the goals for technology use with students with M/M disabilities) (see Table 9).

Assessment performance competencies

With respect to subjects' assessment performance competencies and their school type, middle school building administrators had a significantly higher mean performance mean score for P1 (i.e., address equity, ethical, legal, and human issues related to technology use in general and special education) than high school building administrators. University laboratory/ BESE school building administrators had a significantly higher mean performance competency score for P2 (i.e., inspire the development of a shared vision for integration of technology for students with M/M disabilities, and foster an environment and culture that support this vision) than high school building administrators (see Table 10). The findings also suggested that professional characteristics (special education degree, position, and years of administrative experience), school characteristics (number of teachers employed and total number of students enrolled), technology integration and practice, and special education experience did not affect building administrators' assessment of knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities (see Table 4-6).

Recommendation for future technology integration practice

Subjects recommended professional development (35.85%), software (23.53%), technology budget (22.67%), collaboration (21.70%), and community involvement (19.81%) as the important key components for future technology integration and practice for students with M/M disabilities.

¹ Copies of tables with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wall, and means and standard deviation findings for significant and non-significant MANOVAs can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Bandjersakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Discussion

The general findings suggested that school type and number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled affected subjects' assessment of knowledge competencies, number of students with M/M disabilities enrolled affected subjects' assessment of disposition competencies, and school type affect subjects' assessment of performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities.

Future technology integration for students with M/M disabilities should require that:

- (a) school systems make a commitment to have every teacher and building administrator engaged in professional development programs related to technology (including assistive technology) or technology integration and those programs must match participants' needs, abilities, and disciplines;
- (b) schools provide appropriate software that meet the students' individual needs, and teachers (general and special education) must be trained how to use and evaluate those software;
- (c) local school districts and the state department of education provide funds to support technology use in special education (including in the budget funds for equipment, software, training, technical support, and maintenance);
- (d) collaboration be addressed among individuals who are involved in the technology integration for students with M/M disabilities; and
- (e) schools encourage community involvement and support for technology integration for exceptional learners (e.g., provide opportunities for community members to be trained, to use resources, to share their expertise, and to donate equipments or software).

Limitations

This study had a number of limitations. The major limitations include:

1. The generalizability of the findings is limited to 177 building administrators employed in a metropolitan area (southeastern state).
2. The generalizability of the findings is limited to the 10 knowledge, 10 disposition, and 10 performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities posed in the study and used to develop the instrument administered in this study.

Recommendations for future studies

It is recommended that:

1. Future studies should be expanded to include an investigation of building administrators' assessment of their knowledge, disposition, and performance competencies for technology integration for students with M/M disabilities (e.g., how do they rate themselves on each competency). Future studies could also investigate the relationship or correlation among subjects' knowledge, disposition, and performance competency scores.
2. The population should be expanded and include building administrators from other parishes and city school
3. A larger, representative sample should be selected from the population to serve as subjects in order to expand the generalizability of the findings of the study.
3. Future research should include additional independent variables such as school geographical area (e.g., rural, urban, and suburban), gender (male and female), and age (e.g., 45 or less and 46 or more years old).
4. Future research could use an alternative form of data collection as opposed to a self-administered questionnaire. For example, face to face interviews could be used.

Knowledge Competency	Description
K1	Legal, ethical, equity, and human issues related to technology
K2	Goals for using technology in special education
K3	The benefits and impact of technology on students with M/M disabilities
K4	Administrators' roles and responsibilities in implementing a technology integration plan for students with M/M disabilities
K5	Factors that inhibit/ease technology integration for students with M/M disabilities
K6	Technology knowledge, skills, and attitudes of current teachers working with students with M/M disabilities
K7	Best practices, strategies, and research for effective technology integration for students with M/M disabilities
K8	Best practices, strategies, and research for effective staff development models for technology integration, supervising, coaching, and evaluating teachers relative to technology
K9	Emerging technologies that support administrative tasks and enhance instruction and student learning
K10	Current budget and sources of funds for technology integration plans (e.g., hardware and software, support and maintenance, and professional development)

Figure 1: Descriptions of Knowledge Competencies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Disposition Competency	Description
D1	Special education laws, policies, and procedures should be upheld to protect the rights of students with disabilities.
D2	Technology integration for students with M/M disabilities cannot be successful without administrators' visionary leadership.
D3	Building administrators should have clear ideas about the goals for technology use with students with M/M disabilities.
D4	Technology can enhance the achievement of students with M/M disabilities.
D5	Technology can improve school administration and management by increasing productivity and efficiency.
D6	Administrative uses of technology free teachers from burdensome paperwork and allow them to have more time to work with students.
D7	Teachers must be supported in their use of technology for teaching, learning, professional development, and collaboration.
D8	Building administrators need professional development in technology as much as teachers and other staff.
D9	Technology should never be dumped into teachers' classroom without support staff in place to address issues that may arise.
D10	Teachers need adequate time for planning, familiarization with technology (hardware and software), preparation of any adapted materials, or collaboration with other teachers/support personnel.

Figure 2: Descriptions of Disposition Competencies

Performance Competency	Description
P1	Address equity, ethical, legal, and human issues related to technology use in general and special education
P2	Inspire the development of a shared vision for integration of technology for students with M/M disabilities, and foster an environment and culture that support this vision
P3	Use research data to identify and address factors that inhibit or promote technology integration for students with M/M disabilities
P4	Use research data from multiple resources and engage staff to participate in the problem-solving process
P5	Use research data from multiple resources to design and implement professional development activities and to make decisions about equipment and support acquisition
P6	Ensure that curriculum design, instructional strategies and learning environments integrate appropriate technologies to maximize learning and teaching of students with M/M disabilities
P7	Use a variety of technologies (e.g., voice mail, e-mail, FAX, WWW, etc.) to communicate with students, teachers, parents, the public, businesses and district or state leaders
P8	Use a variety of technologies (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, desktop publishing, and Internet) to do administrative tasks, to search for and obtain information, and problem solve with colleagues or experts
P9	Engage in professional development activities involving technology integration for students with M/M disabilities and make such activities available to others
P10	Allocate current budget and sources of funds to develop a technology plan, obtain equipment, train staff, and support personnel

Figure 3: Descriptions of Performance Competencies

Table 1
Summary of Building Administrators' Knowledge Competencies
Assessment Scores (N = 106)

Knowledge Competency	Frequency/Percentage of Assessment Score				Mean
	1 = Strongly Disagree N / %	2 = Disagree N / %	3 = Agree N / %	4 = Strongly Agree N / %	
K1	2 / 1.9%	2 / 1.9%	33 / 31.1%	69 / 65.1%	3.59
K2	3 / 2.8%	1 / .9%	42 / 39.6%	60 / 56.6%	3.50
K3	2 / 1.9%	4 / 3.8%	43 / 40.6%	57 / 53.8%	3.46
K4	3 / 2.8%	1 / .9%	43 / 40.6%	59 / 55.7%	3.49
K5	1 / .9%	5 / 4.7%	54 / 50.9%	46 / 43.4%	3.37
K6	2 / 1.9%	1 / .9%	39 / 36.8%	64 / 60.4%	3.56
K7	2 / 1.9%	5 / 4.7%	38 / 35.8%	61 / 57.5%	3.49
K8	1 / .9%	4 / 3.8%	46 / 43.4%	55 / 51.9%	3.46
K9	2 / 1.9%	1 / .9%	47 / 44.3%	56 / 52.8%	3.48
K10	1 / .9%	5 / 4.7%	40 / 37.7%	60 / 56.6%	3.50

Note. Overall or Grand Mean = 3.49

Table 2
Summary of Building Administrators' Disposition Competencies
Assessment Scores (N = 106)

Disposition Competency	Frequency/Percentage of Assessment Score				Mean
	1 = Strongly Disagree N / %	2 = Disagree N / %	3 = Agree N / %	4 = Strongly Agree N / %	
D1	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	35 / 33.0%	69 / 65.1%	3.48
D2	2 / 1.9%	4 / 3.8%	48 / 45.3%	52 / 49.1%	3.61
D3	2 / 1.9%	4 / 3.8%	49 / 46.2%	51 / 48.1%	3.41
D4	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	49 / 46.2%	55 / 51.9%	3.48
D5	2 / 1.9%	1 / .9%	47 / 44.3%	56 / 52.8%	3.48
D6	3 / 2.8%	10 / 9.4%	47 / 44.3%	46 / 43.4%	3.28
D7	2 / 1.9%	1 / .9%	33 / 31.1%	70 / 66.0%	3.61
D8	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	39 / 36.8%	65 / 61.3%	3.57
D9	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	34 / 32.1%	70 / 66.0%	3.62
D10	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	29 / 27.4%	75 / 70.8%	3.67

Note. Overall or Grand Mean = 3.52

Table 3
Summary of Building Administrators' Performance Competencies
Assessment Scores (N = 106)

Performance Competency	Frequency/Percentage of Assessment Score				Mean
	1 = Strongly Disagree N / %	2 = Disagree N / %	3 = Agree N / %	4 = Strongly Agree N / %	
P1	1 / .9%	3 / 2.8%	44 / 41.5%	58 / 54.7%	3.50
P2	2 / 1.9%	3 / 2.8%	48 / 45.3%	53 / 45.3%	3.43
P3	2 / 1.9%	5 / 4.7%	51 / 48.1%	48 / 45.3%	3.36
P4	2 / 1.9%	6 / 5.70%	48 / 45.3%	50 / 47.2%	3.37
P5	2 / 1.9%	5 / 4.7%	47 / 44.3%	49 / 46.2%	3.37
P6	1 / .9%	1 / .9%	48 / 45.3%	56 / 52.8%	3.50
P7	2 / 1.9%	0 / 0%	45 / 42.5%	59 / 55.7%	3.51
P8	3 / 2.8%	2 / 1.9%	43 / 40.6%	58 / 54.7%	3.47
P9	2 / 1.9%	2 / 1.9%	46 / 43.4%	56 / 52.8%	3.47
P10	2 / 1.9%	4 / 3.8%	46 / 43.4%	54 / 50.9%	3.43

Note. Overall or Grand Mean = 3.45

Table 4
MANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Knowledge Competency Assessment Scores
by Factors ($N = 106$)

<i>Knowledge Competency*</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Wilks' Lamda</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
K1-K10	Degree in Special Education	.930	10.00, 95.00	.712**
K1-K10	Position	.895	10.00, 95.00	.363
K1-K10	Years of Administrative Experience	.920	10.00, 95.00	.600
K1-K10	School Type	.591	30.00, 273.65	.008**
K1-K10	Number of Teachers Employed	.856	10.00, 95.00	.120
K1-K10	Total Number of Students Enrolled	.887	10.00, 95.00	.293
K1-K10	Number of Students with M/M Disabilities Enrolled	.795	10.00, 95.00	.012
K1-K10	Technology Integration and Practice	.890	10.00, 95.00	.316
K1-K10	Special Education Experience	.856	10.00, 95.00	.118

* See Figure 1

** MANOVA homogeneity of co-variance-variance assumption not met

Copies of tables with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, and descriptive statistics findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdsakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 5
MANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Disposition Competency Assessment Scores
by Factors ($N = 106$)

<i>Disposition Competency*</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Wilks' Lamda</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
D1-D10	Degree in Special Education.	.884	10.00, 95.00	.274**
D1-D10	Position	.939	10.00, 95.00	.796
D1-D10	Years of Administrative Experience	.901	10.00, 95.00	.415
D1-D10	School Type	.684	30.00, 273.649	.171**
D1-D10	Number of Teachers Employed	.926	10.00, 95.00	.074
D1-D10	Total Number of Students Enrolled	.956	10.00, 95.00	.925
D1-D10	Number of Students with M/M Disabilities Enrolled	.808	10.00, 95.00	.021**
D1-D10	Technology Integration and Practice	.829	10.00, 95.00	.046
D1-D10	Special Education Experience	.835	10.00, 95.00	.058

* See Figure 2

** MANOVA homogeneity of co-variance-variance assumption not met

Copies of tables with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, and descriptive statistics findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdasakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 6
MANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Performance Competency Assessment Scores
by Factors ($N = 106$)

<i>Performance Competency*</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Wilks' Lamda</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
P1-P10	Degree in Special Education.	.928	10.00, 95.00	.072
P1-P10	Position	.887	10.00, 95.00	.295
P1-P10	Years of Administrative Experience	.911	10.00, 95.00	.509
P1-P10	School Type	.558	30.00, 273.649	.002**
P1-P10	Number of Teachers Employed	.865	10.00, 95.00	.159
P1-P10	Total Number of Students Enrolled	.825	10.00, 95.00	.040
P1-P10	Number of Students with M/M Disabilities Enrolled	.846	10.00, 95.00	.085
P1-P10	Technology Integration and Practice	.883	10.00, 95.00	.263
P1-P10	Special Education Experience	.960	10.00, 95.00	.946

* See Figure 3

** MANOVA homogeneity of co-variance-variance assumption not met

Copies of tables with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, and descriptive statistics findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdasakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 7
ANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Knowledge Competency
Assessment Scores by School Type ($N = 106$)

<i>Knowledge Competency*</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>eta Squared</i>
K1	.948	3, 102	.794	.500	.023
K2	3.385	3, 102	2.669	.052	.073
K3	1.671	3, 102	1.272	.288	.036
K4	4.505	3, 102	3.648	.015**	.097
K5	1.835	3, 102	1.608	.192	.045
K6	.489	3, 102	.420	.739	.012
K7	4.086	3, 102	3.129	.029**	.084
K8	6.547	3, 102	.233	.874	.007
K9	2.985	3, 102	2.708	.049**	.074
K10	1.922	3, 102	1.610	.192	.045

* See Figure 1

** Significant at $p < .05$

Copies of tables with means and standard deviations for significant and non-significant ANOVA findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdsakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 8
ANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Knowledge Competency Assessment Scores
by Number of Students with M/M Disabilities Enrolled ($N= 106$)

<i>Knowledge Competency*</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>eta Squared</i>
K1	.315	1, 104	.795	.375	.008
K2	2.487	1, 104	5.876	.017**	.053
K3	2.280	1, 104	5.381	.022**	.049
K4	.757	1, 104	1.722	.192	.016
K5	.307	1, 104	.792	.376	.008
K6	2.814	1, 104	7.835	.006**	.070
K7	2.752	1, 104	6.256	.014**	.057
K8	2.280	1, 104	6.229	.014**	.057
K9	.907	1, 104	2.383	.126	.022
K10	.971	1, 104	2.433	.122	.023

* See Figure 1

** Significant at $p < .05$

Copies of tables with means and standard deviations for significant and non-significant ANOVA findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdsakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 9
ANOVA Findings for the Disposition Competency Assessment Scores
by Number of Students with M/M Disabilities Enrolled ($N= 106$)

<i>Disposition Competency*</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>eta Squared</i>
D1	1.408	1, 104	4.097	.046**	.038
D2	.291	1, 104	.666	.416	.006
D3	3.254	1, 104	7.999	.006**	.071
D4	1.321	1, 104	3.698	.057	.034
D5	.130	1, 104	.336	.564	.003
D6	7.968	1, 104	.014	.906	.000
D7	1.408	1, 104	3.880	.052	.036
D8	.851	1, 104	2.338	.125	.022
D9	.907	1, 104	.748	.389	.007
D10	.263	1, 104	1.439	.233	.014

* See Figure 2

** Significant at the $p < .05$

Copies of tables with means and standard deviations for significant and non-significant ANOVA findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdsakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.

Table 10
ANOVA Findings for the Subjects' Performance Competency Assessment Scores
by School Type ($N = 106$)

<i>Performance Competency*</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>eta Squared</i>
P1	4.232	3, 102	4.199	.008**	.110
P2	3.972	3, 102	3.371	.021**	.090
P3	4.569	3, 102	3.716	.014**	.099
P4	3.153	3, 102	2.343	.077	.064
P5	1.583	3, 102	1.188	.318	.034
P6	2.141	3, 102	2.249	.087	.062
P7	2.799	3, 102	2.669	.052	.073
P8	3.063	3, 102	2.296	.082	.063
P9	3.226	3, 102	2.799	.044**	.076
P10	2.298	3, 102	1.786	.155	.050

* See Figure 3

** Significant at $p < .05$

Copies of tables with means and standard deviations for significant and non-significant ANOVA findings can be obtained by contacting Dr. Natee Banjerdasakul at Natee1960@Yahoo.Com.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <u>Building Administrators' Knowledge, Disposition, and Performance Competencies for Technology Integration for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</u>	
Author(s): <u>Natee Banjerdasakul, Ph.D., Jimmy D. Lindsey, Ph.D.</u>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <u>Nov 6, 2002</u>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
--

1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign
here, →
please

Signature: <u>Natee Banjerdasakul</u>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <u>Jimmy D. Lindsey, Ph.D.</u>
Organization/Address: <u>Southern University</u> <u>Baton Rouge, LA 70813</u> <u>(16420 Plantation Blvd.)</u> <u>Princetonville, LA 70769</u>	Telephone: <u>(225) 771-3900</u> FAX: <u>(225) 229-0958</u>
	E-Mail Address: <u>Natee@1960@yahoo.com</u> Date: <u>Nov 6, 2002</u>
	<u>JLindsey@subr.edu</u> (Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706**

Telephone: 301-552-4200

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfacility.org>